### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To:			PCT	
see form PCT/ISA/220			WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43 <i>bis.</i> 1)	
			Date of mailing (day/month/year)	see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220			FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
	national application No. F/JP2005/018912	International filing date (07.10.2005	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 15.10.2004
H04	national Patent Classification (IPC) or IN1/32, G06T1/00 Icant TSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUS		i and if U	
1.	☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of Box No. V Reasoned state applicability; of ☐ Box No. VI Certain docum	pinion ment of opinion with reg of invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation	gard to novelty, inver is.1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such s	ntive step and industrial applicability to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement
1.	Box No. I Basis of the operation of the	ment of opinion with regot invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> , itations and explanation tents cited	gard to novelty, inver is.1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such s aplication	to novelty, inventive step or industrial
	Box No. I Basis of the operation of the later of the priority  Box No. III Non-establish Box No. IV Lack of unity of the priority  Box No. V Reasoned state applicability; of the priority of the later of the later of the later opinion of the later at later opinion of the later opinion opinion of the later opinion opi	ment of opinion with regot invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> , itations and explanation nents cited is in the international approximation on the international approximation is nal Preliminary Examination is the international preliminary Examination is the international preliminary Examination is the internation of the internation is the internation is the internation of the internation is the internation of the internation is the internation is the internation of th	gard to novelty, invertis.1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such supplication and application made, this opinion and Authority ("IPEA" to be the IPEA and the supplication and the supplication and the supplication are supplied to be the supplication and the supplication and the supplication are supplied to supplied the supplied the supplied the supplied to supplied the supplie	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement  will usually be considered to be a ). However, this does not apply where he chosen IPEA has notifed the
	Box No. I Basis of the operation of the applicant to the IPEA a written representation. I Box No. II Basis of the operation of the International Bureau under Rule will not the IPEA a written representation. I Box No. VII Basis of the operation of the Internation of International Bureau under Rule will not be so considered.	ment of opinion with regot invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> , itations and explanation nents cited as in the international approximation on the international Preliminary examination is nal Preliminary Examinity other than this one of 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written have, considered to be ably together, where approximation of the solution	gard to novelty, invertis.1(a)(i) with regard to supporting such a supporting such a supplication and application made, this opinion of the print of	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement  will usually be considered to be a ). However, this does not apply where he chosen IPEA has notifed the

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Azaustre Maleno, V Telephone No. +31 70 340-4147



### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/JP2005/018912

	Box	No. I Basis of the opinion		
1.	<ol> <li>With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international applit the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.</li> <li>This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international se (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).</li> </ol>			
2.	With nece	With regard to any <b>nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence</b> disclosed in the international application a necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:		
	a. type of material:			
		a sequence listing		
•		table(s) related to the sequence listing		
)	b. for	b. format of material:		
		in written format		
		in computer readable form		
	c. tim	e of filing/furnishing:		
		contained in the international application as filed.		
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.		
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.		
3.	ľ	n addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto las been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.		
4.	Addit	ional comments:		

#### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/JP2005/018912

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-19

No:

Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

Claims No:

1-19

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-19

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

# AP3 Rec'd PCT/PTO 15 JUNE No.

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/JP2005/018912

- 1. Reference is made to the following documents:
  - D1: DANIEL GRUHL, WALTER BENDER: "Information Hiding to Foil the Casual Counterfeiter" LECTURE NOTES IN COMPUTER SCIENCE, PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON INFORMATION HIDING, vol. 1525, 1998, pages 1-15, XP002358859 Springer-Verlag, London, UK ISBN: 3-540-65386-4
  - D2: W. BENDER, D. GRUHL, N. MORIMOTO, AIGUO LU: "Techniques for data hiding" IBM SYSTEMS JOURNAL, vol. 35, no. 3-4, 1996, pages 313-336, XP002358860 IBM Corp. Riverton, NJ, USA ISSN: 0018-8670
  - D3: RYO SUGIHARA: "Practical Capacity of Digital Watermarks" IBM TOKYO RESEARCH LABORATORY, [Online] 25 April 2001 (2001-04-25), 27 April 2001 (2001-04-27) XP002358861 4th International Information Hiding Workshop, Pittsburgh Retrieved from the Internet: URL:http://www.research.ibm.com/trl/projec ts/RightsManagement/datahiding/paper/Sugir yo\_IH2001Slide.pdf> [retrieved on 2005-12-13]
  - D4: IN-KWON YEO, HYOUNG JOONG KIM: "Modified Patchwork Algorithm: A Novel Audio Watermarking Scheme" IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SPEECH AND AUDIO PROCESSING, vol. 11, no. 4, 2003, pages 381-386, XP002358862 ISSN: 1063-6676
- 2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-19 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

Document D1, which is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 11, discloses an information-detecting method (see D1, pages 3-9) from which the subject-matter of claim 11 differs in that a set of neighbouring data wherein no information has been embedded is considered in a change amount calculation process for the detection of the additional information.

The problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as the detection of information embedded in a data set by analysis of said data set and other neighbouring data.

 $(\cdot,\cdot)$ 

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

The solution proposed in claim 11 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) because under the assumptions of equations 1 and 2 (see description pages 2 and 3) the introduction of terms related to neighbouring data as in equation 3 (see description page 14) has a negligible effect (they approach the value of zero) and is therefore merely an obvious option.

The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claims 1 and 19, which therefore are also considered not inventive.

Dependent claims 2-10 and 12-18 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty or inventive step, see documents D1 to D4 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.